UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DARRELL GUNN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ANTHONY J. ANNUCCI, Acting Commissioner; THOMAS R. GRIFFIN, Superintendent,

Defendants.

ORDER OF SERVICE

20-CV-2004 (PMH)

PHILIP M. HALPERN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, currently incarcerated in Sing Sing Correctional Facility, brings this *pro se* action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that, while he was incarcerated in Green Haven Correctional Facility, Defendants violated his rights. By order dated March 30, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed without prepayment of fees, that is, *in forma pauperis* (IFP).¹

DISCUSSION

A. Service on Defendants

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summonses and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the

¹ Prisoners are not exempt from paying the full filing fee even when they have been granted permission to proceed IFP. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1).

summonses and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summonses are issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants Anthony Annucci, Acting

Commissioner, and Thomas R. Griffin, Superintendent, through the U.S. Marshals Service, the

Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form

("USM-285 form") for each of these Defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals

Service to effect service upon these Defendants.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses, complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Anthony Annucci, Acting Commissioner, and Thomas R. Griffin, Superintendent, and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

Dated: New York, New York April 10, 2020

SO ORDERED:

Philip M. Halpern

United States District Judge

DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES

- 1. Anthony J. Annucci
 Acting Commissioner NYDOCCS
 The Harriman State Campus
 1220 Washington Avenue
 Albany, New York 12226
- 2. Thomas Griffin, Superintendent Green Haven Correctional Facility 594 Route 216 Stormville, New York 12582